REMARKS

The Official Action dated August 24, 2004, has been carefully considered. Accordingly, the changes and remarks presented herewith are believed sufficient to place the present invention in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 69, 71, 72, and 74-78 have been amended. Claim 79 has been added and claims 68, 70 and 73 have been cancelled. Support for claim 79 can be found in original claims 68, 70 and 73. Since this amendment does not involve any introduction of new matter, entry is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has objected to the numbering of the claims. The application as filed contained claims 1-65 and 73-74. The Applicants affirm with the Examiner that misnumbered claims 73 and 74 have been renumbered as 66 and 67. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claim 69 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner asserted that R⁵ should be mono-valence based. The Examiner is correct that R⁵ is a monovalent moiety. The structure depicted on pages 5 and 21 of the specification as filed, as well as two of the exemplary aminosilanes identified on page 21, line 22, through page 22, line 2, of the specification, clearly demonstrate that R⁵ is a monovalent moiety. In particular, the specification suggests use of N-[2-(vinylbenzylamino)ethyl]-3-aminopropyltrimethoxy ("SAAPS") or aminoethyl-aminopropyltrimethoxy silane ("AEPS"), both of which include a divalent R⁵ moiety. Thus, it is clear that the definition of R⁵ in the specification and claims was merely a typographical error, as R⁵ should have been defined as being chosen from the group consisting of: hydrogen, C₁ - C₁₀ alkyl, C₁ - C₁₀ alkyl substituted with one or more amino groups, C₁ - C₁₀ alkenyl, C₁ - C₁₀ alkenyl substituted with one or more amino groups, aryl, and alkylaryl (rather than hydrogen, C₁ - C₁₀ alkylene, C₁ - C₁₀ alkylene substituted with one or more amino groups, C₁ - C₁₀ alkenylene, C₁ - C₁₀ alkenylene substituted with one or more amino groups, arylene, and alkylarylene). For this reason, the specification has been amended accordingly at pages 5 and 21 (as shown above). Claim 69 has also been amended in this same manner.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 68-69 and 72 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 57-044690. In addition, claims 68-72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Poutasse, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,622,782). Claims 68 and 70 have been cancelled and claims 69 and 71-72 have been amended to depend from newly added claim 79, thereby mooting the Examiner's rejection of these claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 73-78 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Newly added claim 79 contains the limitations of claim 73 along with the limitations of the base claim 68 and the intervening claim 70, and therefore it is believed to be allowable. Claims 69, 71, 72 and 74-78 have been amended to depend from the newly added claim 79. As such, it is believed that claims 69, 71, 72 and 74-79 as presently amended are allowable. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the specification for minor informalities. The specification has been amended by the present amendment to correct various informalities and to update the current status of all nonprovisional parent applications referenced in the specification. Since this amendment does not involve any introduction of new matter, entry is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the specification for having two page numbers on each page. Filed herewith, is a substitute specification which has only one page number. The substitute specification reflects the amendment to the specification made by the Preliminary Amendment of August 8, 2003 but the substitute specification does not reflect the amendments to the specification contained in this present Amendment. The substitute

specification does not involve any introduction of new matter. Accordingly, entry is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

It is believed that the above represents a complete response to the Examiner's objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 112 and places the present invention in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and an early allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Geoffrey L. Oberhaus Registration No. 42,955 Dinsmore & Shohl LLP 1900 Chemed Center 255 East Fifth Street

Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

(513) 977-8623

1072252_1.DOC